

## Buckley and Moynihan in Accord on Foreign Affairs

By FRANK LYNN

*New York Times (1923-Current file); Oct 8, 1976;*

ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2008)

pg. 46



The New York Times

**PROTEST BY POLICE:** Off-duty police officers scuffling with uniformed officers last night in Times Square as demonstrations continued against the city over new work schedules and back pay. Page A21.

## Buckley and Moynihan in Accord on Foreign Affairs

By FRANK LYNN

In a literate, lively and often witty debate, Senator James L. Buckley and his Democratic opponent, Daniel P. Moynihan, disagreed fundamentally yesterday on various domestic issues, but displayed wide agreement on foreign affairs, particularly the continuing threat of the Soviet Union.

In their first debate—across a narrow table in a New York Times conference room—the two candidates were courtly and cordial to each other despite markedly different styles. They often used humor to make their points and frequently referred to each other by their first names.

Nevertheless, they sharply differed on issues such as Federal guarantees for New York City bonds, a Federal takeover of welfare, a constitutional amendment

on abortion and, in general, the role of the Federal Government in the economy and social welfare—with Mr. Moynihan taking the more traditional liberal view.

These differences faded on issues such as the continuing threat of the Soviet Union, Communist domination of Eastern

---

*Excerpts from the senatorial debate will be found on page A20.*

---

Europe, the pardon of Richard M. Nixon, amnesty for draft evaders, dealings with Third World nations and reaction to a further increase in oil prices.

They agreed more than they disagreed—pointing up Mr. Moynihan's strategy of assuming considerable liberal support and moving rightward across the ideological spectrum to attempt to isolate Mr. Buckley on the right.

Mr. Buckley, in turn, is assuming sup-

port on the right and attempting to move leftward to capture the center of the political spectrum.

Their strongest disagreement was a fundamental, philosophical difference on the role of the Federal Government that showed up as soon as they began talking to an audience of Times reporters and editors as well as campaign aides and other newsmen.

"I think that you have really never gotten over your initial horror of the New Deal," said Mr. Moynihan in his second sentence and with a broad smile, setting a tone that was to be followed for the next hour and 40 minutes. Across the table, Senator Buckley sat with his chin in his hand, a frequent posture of both men.

"I do reject a portion of the New Deal

---

**Continued on Page A21, Col. 1**

# Buckley and Moynihan Contend Over the Role of Government

Continued From Page A1

and that's the policy of tax-tax, spend-spend, elect-elect," the Senator said in a softer tone and a more serious vein.

That philosophical split was reflected in the two men's different positions on welfare and aid to New York City.

Senator Buckley opposed a Federal takeover of welfare, arguing that the state should assume the local share to relieve the burden on property owners. Mr. Moynihan favored a Federal takeover to distribute the welfare cost nationally.

Mr. Moynihan favored Federal guarantee of New York City bonds to bail out the city and reduce "outrageous" interest costs of its borrowing. Senator Buckley favored Federal loans only in emergency situations, so that the city would put "its own house in order."

Senator Buckley injected some humor—and made a point—in a lengthy and familiar discussion on the role of Federal Government in New York City by expressing mock surprise that Mr. Moynihan "did not mention what I thought was the kingpin, the linchpin of his New York program—that was to federalize Central Park." He was referring to the Democratic candidate's suggestion that the Federal Government support the park as a national resource.

"That is the ornament of an otherwise intricately engineered program," responded a smiling Mr. Moynihan, with one of his characteristically sweeping gestures.

Mr. Moynihan chided Senator Buckley on the failure of his Republican colleague, Senator Jacob K. Javits, to endorse him, saying that the Senator would not endorse Mr. Buckley because of his initial resistance to Federal aid for New York City during the fiscal crisis.

Mr. Buckley did not directly respond to this until much later in the debate when he noted with a broad smile: "You have your Bella Abzug and I have my Senator Javits." Mrs. Abzug, a Senate aspirant herself in the Democratic primary, has declined to endorse Mr. Moynihan.

The disagreements were apparent in other domestic areas.

Mr. Moynihan said he would not pressure educational television stations to air his campaign commercials, as Mr. Buckley had. "It is not in the spirit of public television to use it for political advertising," he said. Mr. Buckley responded that such commercials would be consistent with the educational function of such stations.

Both candidates reiterated their differences on a constitutional amendment invalidating the Supreme Court ban on abortion laws—"this is where you and I are profoundly at odds," said Mr. Moynihan, who opposes such an amendment. Mr. Buckley co-sponsored such an amendment.

But the Democrat attacked the Supreme Court decision permitting a minor to have an abortion without the permission of her parents. It was one of several apparent shifts in emphasis from his stands in the Democratic primary, where he was

facing three liberal Democratic opponents. "I think the Supreme Court has gone too far; we ought to reverse it as we have reversed other situations of the Court getting itself into extreme positions—by the change of judges, which is the normal solution," said Mr. Moynihan. Like Senator Buckley, he reiterated his personal opposition to abortion.

Mr. Moynihan also appeared to retreat somewhat from what was interpreted as a recent endorsement of the right of teachers to strike. Like Senator Buckley, he supported the state's Taylor Law, which bars such strikes. "I detect no serious sentiment in the state to change the law," the Democratic candidate said.

The agreements between the two candidates were considerably more frequent on foreign affairs and national defense.

## Accord on Soviet Threat

They agreed that the Soviet Union was less of a threat than it had been 20 years ago largely because there was less chance of that nation's "stumbling" into a nuclear confrontation.

But they also expressed the view that the Soviet Union was a continuing threat. "The Soviet Union is in an expansionist phase," said Mr. Moynihan.

Mr. Buckley echoed his opponent. "We live, therefore, in my estimation in an essentially more dangerous world than we did before, and we've got to correct the assumptions of the Soviets both as to our capacity to defend ourselves but also as to our will to defend ourselves," Mr. Buckley said.

Both candidates disagreed with President Ford that Eastern Europe was free. "The fact is," said Senator Buckley, "you've got huge divisions, Soviet divisions, armor ready to stamp out any flicker of independence."

Mr. Buckley taxed Mr. Moynihan for his echo during the Democratic primary of the Democratic platform calling for a \$5 billion to \$7 billion cut in defense spending.

Mr. Moynihan responded that "you should have seen what we didn't put in that platform

Mr. Moynihan also appeared to shift on the question of the B-1 bomber to replace aging B-52's. Mr. Moynihan had opposed the B-1 as late as this week, saying that it would arrive on target "a half hour after the world blew up." But, yesterday, after some discussion and prodding from Mr. Buckley, he shrugged his shoulders and said: "I just have to say to you, I'm mixed."

But when Senator Buckley noted that the country had to be conscious of its own economic resources, Mr. Moynihan seized the opening to reprise an earlier discussion about Mr. Buckley's interest in the environment, particularly Alaskan caribou, and to mock Mr. Buckley's concern about big government.

"Please remember," Mr. Moynihan said solemnly, "there's a limit to the amount of money I will spend in support of the caribou . . . and at \$5,000 for caribou, I say enough—get the Department of the Interior the hell out of the caribou's life."